the village, or meet (by design or otherwise) in their own or a neighbor's camp. Therefore, courting couples merely observing the usual forms may pass unnoticed, unless their avoidance or pretended lack of awareness of each other's presence is so elaborate or pointed as to become obvious. 584 576

However, secretiveness itself is merely the overt pattern, for many courtships on both primary and secondary levels are known and closely followed in gossip. It appears that an individual attempts to keep his amours secret from all but a small circle of friends usually coinciding with members of his own age group. This circle becomes more exclusive in both numbers and margin of age difference as an individual approaches adulthood. 584

With sexual initiation occurring sometimes or perhaps often in childhood play groups, children until puberty may candidly share knowledge of sexual experiences with others of the same age and with younger children. Within this age group some children may witness or openly participate in intercourse carried out in play. Upon reaching puberty, perhaps because physical development makes sexual play less an experimental act, a couple is likely to arrange a secret rendezvous. It appears, however, that a pair of boys may share a tryst with a pair of girls or even with one girl; certainly it is not unusual in cases of mock rape for two boys to "attack" one or two girls. During adolescence individuals of both sexes have confidants. It was not established whether boys' groups more freely discuss their sexual adventures than do girls; girls usually confide in one or more close friends. By comparing notes with a few friends, individuals can guess where most other interests lie in their particular age group, and from such sources information is relayed to virtually the entire social group. A teenage girl stated concisely, "We all know." 864 936 584

While many marriages among younger generations grew out of courtship and some older couples apparently made love matches, Havasupai cultural tradition places no emphasis upon sentimental or romantic love as a basis for marriage. Nor does courtship itself appear to be conceived in such terms. Neither men nor women are thought to pine away, nor do individuals "carry a torch" for an unrequited or forbidden love. A bereaved spouse usually remarries rather soon. In the present older generation, one woman, who fled repeatedly from an arranged marriage because she wanted to marry her lover, eventually accepted her husband, to whom she later appeared devoted. It is said that she "forgot all about" the lover (who, incidentally, had made no attempt to prevent her marriage nor to rescue her from it and who soon married someone else). A few distantly related couples who persisted in marrying for love are strongly censured by the entire social group, while those who disregarded opposition arising from less serious causes to marry for love are more nearly viewed with apathy than championed by public sentiment. (In seeming contradiction to the foregoing, upon the suicide of a youth of 19 in 1954, public opinion strongly condemned the boy's parents for causing his death, reportedly because they had opposed a marriage he desired.) 581 183 832 [762] [208]

832 However, the case warrants closer investigation before conclusions can be
581 drawn. Pertinent factors appearing at the present time include the position
183 of the youth's and his sweetheart's respective parents in the community, an
762 unusual family situation for the boy, public sentiment heightened by the
208 shocking extremity of the manner in which the youth reacted to parental op-
[777] position, and the cultural abhorrence of death. Nor is the influence of the Anglo-American romantic tradition of choosing one's own mate to be disregarded in so recent an example.)

584 Courtship as defined here probably was relatively unimportant in selection of marriage partners during early days, but at the present time it has gained significance. Perhaps it serves physiologically and psychologically to dissipate tensions arising from the sex drive before marriage, and further, to minimize marital adjustment by placing initiation and orientation outside and prior to the marriage relationship.

585 Although marriage formerly was unmarked by ceremony at its inception, it was generally recognizable by the roles of the bride's and groom's parents, the marriage gift, and the bride's open acceptance of the groom at her home. [302] [841] Further, it was publicly marked at the bride's first menses following marriage when the mothers (or other close female relatives) of the bride and groom attended their respective children, washing them and painting their bodies red. Upon termination of the menses, the groom ran at dawn toward the rising sun and the bride at sunset toward the setting sun on four successive days. Young, unmarried girls raced with the bride. Irregularity in [854] observance of these customs now lends uncertainty to the status of a newly married couple.

Growth of Trial Marriage

582 The Havasupai at present practice virtual trial marriage. While this pattern is not explicitly defined in the culture, it occurs regularly and in recognizable form. Although adults generally profess disapproval of its practice, they give it implicit recognition by their uncertainty concerning the status of young couples known to be living together or meeting regularly with frequency.

Public and private speculation concerning the status of a couple while in the transitory stage from courtship to marriage is precisely the clue to recognition of inceptive trial marriage. At that time an affair ceases to be surreptitious and begins to assume the external aspects of marriage. Trial marriage lasts only so long as a couple's marital status remains uncertain or until their association is discontinued. The feature which distinguishes trial marriage from courtship is its open rather than secret aspect.

Thus, trial marriage is characterized by regularity in form and occurrence, by its public nature, and by both private and public uncertainty re-

or if she disliked his marrying a second wife, she could leave him. Her relatives would not insist that she return to him in this case. 595 [586]

Arrangements for a second wife were carried out in the same manner as those for a first wife, except that temporary matrilocal residence was omitted. If a man asked for his wife's sister, her parents might let her go without a gift, but usually they expected something.

New polygynous unions, discouraged by administrative personnel and missionaries, were not formed in reservation times until very recently. An example now exists which, in the absence of restraints, undoubtedly would be a polygynous marriage. The man in question has been married for approximately 30 years to a childless woman. Since about 1952, he has divided his time between this wife and a younger woman who has three illegitimate children. The last two, and possibly the first child (born in 1949), are publicly credited to this man, who readily claims paternity. The man has repeatedly left his legal wife, only to return to her, and, on the other hand, he has had open rifts with the mother of his children. Both women have voiced differing opinions concerning what they want the man to do about the situation. Reportedly, they have also had changes of attitude toward one another, first maligning, then sympathizing by turns. Personal meetings between the two are infrequent because they live in different communities. It was not learned whether or not they seek to avoid such meetings. During recent years, the man has spent short periods alternately with them, but he actually maintains a residence separate from both women. Public sentiment is that he should divorce his wife and marry the second woman, "because she had all those children for him and his wife has none." [208]

Exchange marriage is said to have been common in former times. Ideally, two brothers married two sisters or siblings of opposite sex married a similar pair. Occasionally, other classes of relatives made exchange marriages. Of the latter type was an exchange marriage, occurring about 1910, in which cousins of opposite sex, A and B, married a niece and uncle, C and D, respectively. In this example, B was an orphan who had been reared by her cousin, A, and his wife. When A was left a widower, he and D, also a widower, arranged the exchange. The men were both about 20 years older than the two girls. 582 583

C had been reared by her own parents, who were still living at her marriage. Because she already had a lover, C objected violently to the marriage, fighting and running away, but her parents used force persistently until she submitted to the inevitable. C's new husband gave $50 to her father; C's husband himself received nothing from the other man for B, the cousin toward whom he had acted in the capacity of guardian.

Ordinarily, in an exchange marriage no gifts would have been given, but in this example, a guardian traded his ward to a man whose female relative

The reason given for avoiding the company of this girl was not her alleged prostitution. It was explained, instead, that she caused trouble and said cruel things to them whenever she was present. It is entirely possible that the other girls in reality considered her their rival for masculine attention, and because of her greater popularity, they had banded together against her. 883 578 156 209

Another more pointed example of united public opinion centering on the unpopularity of a woman is that of a widow in middle age. She seemingly feels that most of her fellow tribesmen are persecuting her. She is commonly viewed by the Havasupai as a troublemaker, and her presence is undesired but is tolerated by most of the tribe. This woman is described as having been antisocial from early childhood. Other children treated her with indifference or tolerance, and eventually taunted her for her strange behavior. Today, she considers herself superior to her fellow tribesmen in social conduct. She is given to aggressive and abusive verbal behavior which is largely ignored by others until it reaches a point that can no longer be tolerated. On fence posts and elsewhere about the canyon village area, obscenities have been written coupling names of various young people. These are credited to her authorship. The mother of one girl whose name had been seen in numerous places told the investigator without anger or perceptible excitement that "-----writes all those things, and no one pays any attention to what she writes because we all know she does it." The informant shook her head and added that she could not understand why the woman in question behaved as she did. 158 589 [831]

This widow's behavior is tolerated among her fellow tribesmen seemingly without animosity, although she appears to have no close friends. On the whole, other women appear to treat her kindly and do not take advantage of her. However, she is occasionally baited or teased by the young men. People generally avoid conflict with her whenever possible.

There are in the tribe perhaps two or three other women who have few friends, who are considered difficult to get along with, or who bear strong antagonisms toward a few individuals. Other women, as a rule, avoid trouble with such a person by associating with her as little as possible. Even women of this reputation, however, have their own circles of relatives or close friends, sometimes outside the Havasupai tribe, with whom they do maintain pleasant social relations. 156 157 579 572

Although antagonisms which have arisen over land disputes, or other issues of a serious nature, in a few instances continue to be borne by the disputants, as a general rule grudges are not lasting. Most quarrels are quickly forgotten and injuries are forgiven. 578

Quarrels of a serious character between women usually concern rivalry for the affections of a particular man. A second source of trouble is

8:Service E-5 (1946) 1947
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

428 than a closer one. It is explicitly felt and avowed that no man should be without enough land for himself and his family, and it is this feeling which tends to keep land holdings more equalized than they would be otherwise. It is quite possible that in this factor public opinion, with a conception of community rights in land, intrudes itself most clearly and overrides the idea of familial rights.

All this is not to say that the land is at any given time always equally divided among families in accordance with the enumerated principles. For example, there is at the present time a widespread dissatisfaction with the amount of land controlled by the Sinyella family. This is because, of the once numerous family, only two brothers remain in the canyon, and they are both unable to work. Consequently they have considerably more land than they can use. This excess land lies idle because several younger members of the Sinyella family are now living outside the canyon. It is difficult to foretell exactly how the community will resolve this situation, but I should guess that if the younger Sinyellas do not return soon, someone else, probably newlyweds, will get permission to use some of the land. After a period of occupation, this land will be thought of as theirs. This is the way such conditions have often worked out previously. Spier has stated that proprietary rights in land depended most emphatically on use,[7] and this feeling seems to be strong today. It is difficult to land a piece of land for a while, for after the new incumbent has used it for more than a couple of years, he has a pretty valid claim on it and is difficult to dislodge.

In some cases widows hold some of their husband's land, but it is usually, perhaps always, because of the magnanimity of their dead husband's relatives. As soon as a widow remarries, the land reverts to the original family.[8] In general, land tends to stay in the consanguineal family. Rarely, a daughter as well as a son may share in the family land, especially if she marries a man who has little or no land of his own. The Havasupai say that newlyweds should be given land by whichever family can best afford it, or preferably by both. If they are not given land outright, as is sometimes the case, they should help work the land and share in the produce of whichever family can best accommodate them. Detailed inheritance histories show that actually the husband's family tends to assume this burden more often than the girl's, but it is not a clear cut rule. As already suggested, it is this condition which seems to determine the present day post-marital residence. There is no marriage rule, beyond a feeling that close

7 *Havasupai Ethnography*, p. 291.

8 See Ruth Benedict, *Marital Property Rights in Bilateral Society* (American Anthropologist, vol. 38, pp. 368-373, 1936).